



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

B L

65


V44

K878

1912

MAIN


UC-NRLF



\$B 260 640

10310 YK

GIFT OF
Class of 1887



EX LIBRIS

984e
K97

No


(Vol.)


HUMANI- TARIAN PHILOSOPHY


by

EMIL EDWARD KUSEL











TO THE
MEMBERS OF

Carl F. Kessel

Philosophy

Extracts from the

Journal of

Thou shalt not kill.—Bible.

The individuality created by God is
not carnivorous.—Mary Baker G. Eddy.

Kill not but have regard
for life.—Buddha

Los Angeles, California

1912



Emil E. Kessel

Humanitarian Philosophy

By
EMIL EDWARD KUSEL

Extracts From His Letters

Fourth Edition

Thou shalt not kill.—Bible.

The individuality created by God is
not carnivorous.—Mary Baker G. Eddy.

Kill not but have regard
for life.—Buddha.

Los Angeles, California

1912

TO THE
LIBRARY

Class of 1887

Copyright 1912
by Emil Edward Kusel.
All rights reserved.



BL65
V44K878
1912

NOTE. MAIN

When one meets with adversity and all the world seems bitterly against him or when one realizes the short duration of life and hopes for a splendid immortality, no doubt it is a consolation for many to read the inspired and lofty sentiments of the Bible.

Therefore in writing the following epigrams condemning inhumanity, I felt confident that kindly people would see that it is far from my motive to cast reflection upon any individual inclined to accept the comforting and humane passages of either the Old or New Testament.

I merely aimed to prove the inhuman Mosaic law giving man the idea to kill is not a law of a kind and loving God. I also aimed to prove that the flesh-eating religionist is an accessory to a crime more bestial in the sight of God than any other sin known to the human family.

EMIL E. KUSEL.



671714



KIND WORDS.

"Humanitarian Philosophy" has taught me that God and conscience are in unison. I would have liked to condemn the writer for opening my eyes to the truth, but the Lord is on his side.

"Humanitarian Philosophy" is an eye opener for the true religionist who never before thought on the wickedness of killing.

"Humanitarian Philosophy" is a blessing for those who wish to live the Christ life, although it will not appeal to the religionist who is inhumanly self-righteous.

Since digesting "Humanitarian Philosophy" I know a conscientious person can read the stinging truth without a selfish protest. The truth is mighty.

"Humanitarian Philosophy" at first reading made me angry, but praise God, the vegetarian's heart is in the right place.

"Humanitarian Philosophy" is an inspiration.





COMPLIMENTARY.

Have always been very much interested in the subjects of our able ministers, but since receiving a copy of Mr. Kusel's philosophy against flesh eating I am a convert to the doctrine that neither minister nor congregation can be "a child of God" until they are vegetarians.

It is impossible for me to now believe otherwise on account of the tremendous cruelty and horror of taking the life of animals.

I never thought of the truth as Mr. Kusel puts it forth, and I am surprised to think preachers never preached against blood food. I also thought it would be meet and proper to criticize shoe, glove and belt wearing, but the leather using is a secondary proposition; the animal is first killed for food purposes and secondarily to avoid the waste we may utilize the hide, and still we should discourage that argument.

Mr. Kusel is defending God Almighty nobly in his "Humanitarian Philosophy" and has given the church doctrines a slap no man can gainsay.

When we favor meat eating we favor killing, and when we favor killing in the name of God we know we are liars and murderers, for God is kind and loving, and surely opposes the taking of life. Let churches preach the murder of animals, but pray do not say wickedness (killing) is God's will. The world needs more conscientious men like Mr. Kusel to protect God Almighty from defamation.

T. J. W.

(From Los Angeles Herald.)



A NOBLE WOMAN.

Mr. Emil Edward Kusel,
Los Angeles, Cal.

Dear Mr. Kusel:—I have been wonderfully guided and blessed by reading "Humanitarian Philosophy" as it is truly an inspired work that should be thought upon by all religious people.

The beauty of your blessed reasoning is that you cast all biblical chaff to the four winds and look to God in the true light of love and mercy.

Yes indeed, you show the inconsistency of a religion that gives us an evil right to kill things while every last one of us, without exception, cling to life with the tenacity of a coward.

You fully convince me that false prophets had a hand in writing the Scriptures because God in His Infinite Love could not have created the dear innocent lamb our Savior carried in his bosom to be killed nor could he have created the sweet little baby calf to be slain and eaten by human beings. You convince me that God is not in the slaughter-house, neither in the midst of those who patronize the butcher any more than He is in the heart of the wild beast of prey.

I do believe in a personal God as I could not live without hope for a blissful future life beyond the grave. This pilgrimage, to me, without religion would make this world a very dreary and lonesome place.

Heretofore I lived a carnivorous life, always wondering why God created poor sentient things for human food but now, thank God, I realize, without humanitarianism spirituality is not a reality and I applaud such men as Mr. Kusel for standing out boldly on a grand philosophy that puts all church doctrines to shame and presents a religion consistent with reason.

Your trend of thought, my dear brother, is indeed marvelous from a gracious heart and I believe some mighty power is preparing you for a special great work.

Yours very truly,

MRS. J. R. B.

St. Paul, Minn., May 16, 1911.

THE HERMIT.

No flocks that roam the valley free,
To slaughter I condemn,
Taught by the power that pities me,
I learn to pity them.

—Goldsmith.

In religion, what damned error but some
sober brow will bless it and approve it with a
text, hiding the grossness with fair ornament.

—Shakespeare.

The untold suffering the human family sanctions through a wrong conception of what is right, should make every Christian heart ache.

—Platt.

When men go hunting (to kill) they call it sport but when the hunted animal (perhaps wounded) turns to fight for its life, they call *that* ferocity.—Shaw.

Let all creatures live, as we desire to live.

—Tolstoy.



THE RELIGION OF BUDDHA.

(An Idea from "Light of Asia.")

'Twere good to be humane
to the helpless beast;
Better than to deplore the
sins of the world
With priests who pray for
mankind,
And yet have no mercy
on God's dumb creatures—
"They pray for mercy
Whilst they themselves
are merciless."

—Kusel.



Humanitarian Philosophy

By Emil Edward Kusel

No doubt some of the conscience-stricken readers will brand the author of the sentiments herein as an extremist rather than a humane enthusiast, but bethink yourself it is far better to be "an extremist" on a logical, noble basis than to be inconsistent under false pretense.

The author is presenting truths from an absolutely rational standpoint standing firmly on a real philosophical basis that cannot be overthrown by a cyclone of protests from the "religious" flesh-eating faction.

The idea is to show that man, when he gets "right with God," drifts away from the customs of ancient times and reasons from the Golden Rule foundation which is consistent with a higher life and makes him religiously humane as well as "pious."

You may allow your quasi-religious principle to prevail against reason; you may pout and cry against the Humanitarian's noble philosophy; you may dream of the imps of hell awaiting his quietus; you may consult your Bible to bless your inhumanity and yet mercy for our dumb fellow-creatures is unselfish, pure and gentle, resultant from a proper conception of man's superiority and his God.

If a man's religion is pure and good and undefiled it would be wrong to present facts to blast his belief (be it ever so superstitious); however, when he insists upon inhumanity toward any sentient creature, he should be severely criticised.

The scriptural passages that are well flavored with indecency and the scriptural inhumanity written in God's name are not one whit more inspired than are the objectionable lines of sensational literature.

The Bible has caused more bloodshed, more hatred; made more hypocrites and caused more suffering than all else combined. It is a book containing some lofty ideas and moral laws by good men, but the many inconsistencies therein have caused superstition, imagination, insanity, contemptibility and horrible cruelty that haunts the brain of the honorable thinking masses.

It is proper to impress indelibly in the minds of the pretenders of the several creeds "Thou shalt not kill;" neither shalt thou be accessory in the killing by encouraging the slaughter through patronage.

You may erect your massive temples and dedicate them to Jehovah; you may pray to your heart's content and sing psalms until doomsday, yet the earthquake, the cyclone, the tornado, the volcano overthrows the synagogue, the cathedral, the church, the brothel and the saloon without distinction. Evidently the god of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob is not omnipresent to protect an institution that stands for inhumanity.

One of the most noticeable inconsistencies ever presented to thinking people is the representation of "Divine Love" portrayed under the title "Peace," symbolized by a child leading the cow, the calf, the lion, the leopard and the lamb. This taken from the Bible, is supposed to represent, "And a little child shall lead them."

Just think of symbolizing "Peace" with an innocent child leading animals we actually murder! No doubt every religionist looks upon that painting as a masterpiece—an inspiration. Yet most of them sanction the slaughter of innocence by relishing a lamb chop or a veal cutlet.

"And a little child shall lead them!" Whither? To the slaughter? Is not that a miserable symbolization of "Divine Love" and "Peace?"

Such inconsistency painted in the name of religion is an abomination and deserves strenuous criticism.

Not the least in the realm of inconsistency are the Jewish people who fast on their day of atonement and break the Sabbath fifty-two times a year by bartering. Now where is the consistency in such an atonement when the Bible says explicitly: "Remember the Sabbath day and keep it holy."

Such incongruity is practised universally among the orthodox as well as the reformed element. Like the Gentile, the Jewish religionist, notwithstanding that he admits the horror of viewing the death throes of a butchered animal, eats his flesh food "kosher" to satisfy his palate rather than live up to the promptings of conscience.

Judaism, Catholicism, Protestantism, and Christian Sciencism alike disregard the sacredness of all animal kingdom, and yet, after admitting the horror of the slaughter pen, they all encourage the merciless killing under the cloak of the Bible.

"The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose" may well be applied to the religionist who upholds the killing of our dumb fellow creatures.

The fact that the Bible encourages the murder of an animal proves it is not entirely from the pen of holy men.

The individual who professes religion and says it is right to slay and eat when he can live without taking sentient life, on the vegetation which nature so bountifully provides, is a liar, a murderer and a hypocrite in his own higher conscience.

The so-called devout man wants to live and enjoy life, but he eats of the innocent animal that has been battered to death by the blow of the ax; he contends that a body which suffers pain was created for slaughter to satisfy his beastly palate. Such a man is destitute of the very essence of God-life be he minister, church-goer or layman.

Above all things the minister of the Gospel and the church attendant should be kind and considerate toward all animal creation and should construe the Scriptures and preach to prove the sacredness of their Holy Bible. They should do God's will one earth as it is in Heaven, absolutely abstaining from the flesh-pots of Egypt, thereby discouraging the blotting out of animal life, proving conclusively by their lives that their God is just and kind and merciful.

The man who opposes the spilling of life blood of Nature's creatures is on the higher plane of life.

After searching for a mode of living through which we might find perfect peace on earth and good will toward our fellow-men, we become partially interested in the different religions, but we cannot conscientiously close our eyes and believe a meat-eating, gormandizing religionist is undefiled and passing on to spiritual perfection to ultimately, at dissolution, burst into a glorious immortality.

Read the memorable Sermon on the Mount, supposed to have been delivered by Christ Jesus, and note the humility, the tenderness, the love and all therein that is grand and noble—then decide that such a meek and lowly Nazarene could have eaten of the fleshpots or even have sanctioned the killing of any living creature, and you deprive that character of the very essence of divinity.

Flesh eating man's religion cannot emanate from a kindly heart because with all his intellectuality and knowledge of right and wrong, his animalistic tendencies are in excess. His horror for the slaughter pen is conclusive and positive evidence that the higher consciousness is dormant proving that carnivorous man hath no pre-eminence above the beast.

We fail to see any Christianity in the present-day Sunday churchianity, and we positively know there is nothing sacred in the person upholding the merciless slaughter of animals. Through all this we are made to fully realize the inconsistency of nearly all religious professions. We finally study the Laws of Nature, and we live from that time on according to the dictates of conscience and reason, with some little faith in addition. The first thought that impresses us is the inhuman custom of taking life blood, knowing that every man, woman and child, who possesses an atom of feeling, would shudder to look upon the butchery of our dumb fellow-creatures, and we know if the horror of the slaughter pen is admitted, it surely is a heinous crime to slaughter. Then we begin to delve deep into the real scientific subjects of real scientific men and really discover the real body builders are proper food, proper mastication, proper air and proper breathing, and occasional proper fasting, etc. We live the life as recommended by these noble logicians and benefactors. Now we look from the heights to the vast expanse of empty faith cure, cults and isms, creeds and dogmas, and theories, and realize how narrow they all are by not embodying humanitarianism and the laws of health and hygiene in their teachings.

From a spiritual conception, it is just as reasonable to recommend human cannibalism as the eating of butcher shop carrion.

The 25th day of December is the day set aside to present gifts to our sweethearts, wives and friends; the day Santa Claus brings toys to our little ones to overflow their little hearts with gladness, but mainly to commemorate the birth of one of the kindest characters the world has ever known.

That holy day is horribly desecrated by the quasi-pious element throughout our Christian land in the killing of countless numbers of Nature's sentient creation.

Thanksgiving Day, likewise set aside for a sacred purpose—to thank God for the many blessings bestowed upon our great nation—is also desecrated by religious people as well as by the laity. On the day we should send our thanks to that invisible something (The First Great Cause) we praise an imaginary personal deity by killing things to satiate the craving of the palate.

The Bible condemns the eating of swine flesh Deut. 14: 8; Is. 65: 4), but what care the pharisee so long as he intends pleasing the palate rather than obey the law of his God and conscience?

When we reach the Holy Mountain (consistent religion) we will abstain from eating flesh food and have a heartfelt desire for all creatures to live and enjoy life as we wish to live (Golden Rule.)

Selfish civilized intellectual human takes his gun and repairs to the forest and wantonly slaughters wild game. Perhaps he kills outright; perhaps he wounds; perhaps the animal he has wounded is dying a slow, painful death; perhaps he wounds or kills a mother and the young are starving in nest or lair, and perhaps a professed Jew, Catholic, Protestant or Christian Scientist is relishing the seasoned carrion while the little ones are dying for the want of that mother's care. God forbid the belief in such a god!

The huntsman, who wounds the wild game, goes to his couch and rests peacefully while the poor dumb, wounded animal is dying in the forest, suffering most excruciating pain.

The deer, the dove, the quail and all of Nature's blood creation must suffer with horrifying wounds at the hands of the thoughtless, cruel hunter; upheld by so-called religious people who contend that such inhumanity is permissible in God's sight.

This very day thousands upon thousands of our dumb fellow-creatures are suffering agonizing deaths caused through wounds inflicted by the merciless hunter; and thousands upon thousands of professed Jews, Catholics, Protestants and Christian Scientists worship the god that tolerates such cruelty. Hypocrisy! Inconsistency! Shame!

Sift mankind down to his noblest thought, and he must admit the life of an animal is just as sacred as his own.

Knowing that all humanity feels the horrors of taking the life blood of defenseless animals, you are compelled to condemn every religious institution that does not embody within its creed the vegetarian diet.

Animals instinctively flee from danger, and suffer pain, which proves the brute creation has a right to an appointed time upon the earth. When man slaughters these helpless creatures under the selfish idea that they were created for that purpose, he is destitute of divine principle.

The almighty dollar is the god of the civilized people—mankind takes the sacred life blood of God's creatures and barter the carcass in exchange for money. Nearly all clergymen and the laity eat of the murdered animal. Shame!

Let us be at least considerate and reason on the side of mercy. If your religion sanctions the killing of innocent animals, well then, in the name of all that is pure and good, lay aside your religion and get your soul in tune with the Infinite, and then use your faculties of reason to develop up to the highest ideal.

Condemn the killing of innocent, defenseless animals, and do away with the fleshpots of Egypt, and praise Deity for endowing you with reason sufficient to realize the wrong of shedding life blood, and then sing hosannas for the nobility of living according to the promptings of higher conscience.

Do not think of the savory beef and mutton as it hangs in the market place, but turn your mind and heart to the abattoirs and see the horror of slaughter and then acknowledge that if God is not in the slaughter house to hinder the killing of a dumb brute he is surely not in the churches reserving crowns and halos for a sanctimonious element whose palate takes precedence of principle.

The church folk encourage the killing of quadruped, fish and fowl and then have the audacity to say grace at meal time, thanking God and imploring Him to shower blessings upon them.

You believe in all that elevates man to the highest standard of excellence and yet in the eating of a slaughtered animal you are an accessory to the crime of murder—a crime that is far more morally wrong and horrible than any so-called venial sin.

The man who "believes" and has "faith" solely for his soul's safety through fear rather than through love; the man who affiliates with the church with mercenary motive; the man who testifies with lying tongue to the virtue of his carnivorous unfeeling religion; the man who shifts the blame of his cursedness to the mythical Satan; the man who is weak and bent toward religious emotionalism; the man who sees the mote in every eye but his own; the man who stands on the street corner preaching hell and damnation, "fighting the devil," are the sorts of men who decry that all beings have an equal right to live.

If perchance a fellow human becomes tired and weary of the vicissitudes of this world and cancels his own captivity (suicide), we frantically throw up our hands realizing the enormity of such a crime.

His life is his own and he may do as he pleases; his sin of self-destruction is between himself and his God, and yet we grieve at such a sad exit. The very same man who shudders at the uncanny thought of another's self-murder will uphold the killing of a dumb brute to satiate the "human" palate. The animal does not want to die yet the intelligent man who has a "merciful loving God" makes murder permissible taking his authority from the book he calls "The Sacred Bible."

The Proverbs, the Psalms, the Sermon on the Mount, and many other portions of the Good Book are beautiful, and no doubt the writers of the select passages were inspired, but the evil spirit was surely predominant in the man who depicted the Prince of Peace, in all his humility, as a flesh eater.

A pitiful story to be told about a little girl whose father was supposed to be very devout, and in whose residence the motto,

"GOD IS NOW HERE IN OUR HOME"
adorned the wall, confusedly printed by her illiterate parent.

One beautiful day, as all nature seemed in perfect harmony, the child strolled to the barnyard where the hired man was killing the petted calf preparatory to having a great feast in honor of the son, returning from a western college of theology.

A thought struck the child as she saw the life blood of an innocent animal ebbing away, through a horrible knife wound.

She hastened back to her father's home, sad but wiser, and appropriately divided the motto on the wall:

GOD IS NO WHERE IN OUR HOME.

or as Daniel interpreted King Belshazzar's dream, the thinking child weighed her papa in the balances and found him very much wanting in God principle.

Many so-called pious people throughout the land condemn theaters, dancing, sociable drinking, prize-fighting, card playing,, pastime smoking, Sunday recreation, the innocent custom of Santa Claus and the comic supplements of our Sunday newspapers, yet none of these pleasures and pastimes could be half so abominable and sinful as the encouragement of slaughter.

Every church member construes the Scriptures to please his own individuality; sometimes he construes literally but when the passage does not coincide with his appetite or manner of living he invariably finds a figurative meaning.

We justify almost any sort of life by the Holy Bible, but we cannot pull the blinds over the eyes of conscience.

The Women's Christian Temperance Union cannot influence towards reformation effectively; the women of this religious order are trying to defeat liquor and cigarette traffic, yet loth to realize under their profession of Christianity, they are sinners greater than either the unfortunate cigarette fiend or the drunkard, because they all admit the horror of killing, at the same time relishing a mess of carrion, thereby virtually encouraging the killer to kill more.

The tiger pounces upon the giraffe and rides it to death, all the while tearing the flesh from the bleeding animal; the puma pounces upon the mountain goat; the hyena tears the entrails from its living prey and the cat pounces upon the beautiful song bird and takes its innocent life—where is your merciful, loving, personal God?

The religionist who lives on hallucination or believes that faith alone "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and will not reason, is living in the dark ages still.

If one desires going into absolute truth concerning the killing of helpless animals, he may justly condemn the wearing of leather shoes, gloves, etc., all of which are worn contrary to Nature's Law.

The self-styled religious element send missionaries to foreign lands to spread the gospel of love when they, themselves, as well as those they send, are insufficiently human to recognize the brutality of slaughter.

Take man to the slaughter house to view the butchery, and then if he contends God created helpless, dumb brutes for the slaughter pen, he is positively heartless. If he shudders to witness the hideous butchery, that proves conclusively that God is not omnipresent.

If man wishes to disregard spirituality and remain an agnostic, infidel or an atheist, that is his privilege and he may continue eating carrion and encouraging slaughter, from the lower animal plane, but when he steps over the threshold into religion and affiliates with the churches and talks of man's pre-eminence above the beast he must of necessity be in sympathy with his dumb fellow creatures and abstain from flesh-eating to discourage all things not in harmony with God. (Higher self).

Does it not hurt the innocent lamb when you cut its little throat? Does it not hurt the little calf when you take its tender life? Does it not hurt the cow when you wield the axe with tremendous force against its forehead? Does it not hurt the sheep when in the agonies of death? Does it not hurt when the goat pitifully gurgles the sound "Oh Lord," as its life-blood is passing the butcher's knife? If pain does attend this horrible inhumanity of man, what right then has he to establish for himself a God in Heaven when in reality he hath no more feeling in his miserable carcass than hath the cannibal of the uncivilized isles.

All things may be possible to God, but the idea of placing the breath of life into our fellow-beings to be snuffed out by a superior intellectual animal is the absurdest of all absurdities.

Dancing, theater-going, rag-time music, and all other pleasures to kill the monotony of daily routine, are under the ban of the churches. We carry ourselves aloof from these awful (?) sins and walk in the attitude of solemnity to impress Almighty God with our piety. We preach against liquor and tobacco while we ourselves are addicted to the use of tea and coffee (stimulants). We condemn everything we ourselves do not care for and we jealously admonish others to be just like us. Now if dancing, theater-going, rag-time music, etc., and the immoralities of life are sins of venial proportion, of what colossal magnitude must be the sin of taking life we cannot restore and how immeasurably hellish are the churches that uphold the killing in the name of a merciful God!

The dumb animals were created by Nature same as man (except that we are a little above the animal in intellect), and have a divine right to live out their respective allotted time same as man (minister, church-goer or layman.)

The Buddhist who regards all animal life sacred is on the right path to spirituality, while the carnivorous Jew, Catholic and Protestant are drifting in the rut of dark age fantasy and fanaticism.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q.—Are you not a little bit radical on the subject of Humanitarianism?

A. To you I may be “a little bit radical” because I oppose all religions (yours inclusive) which make mankind selfish and unfeeling.

Q. If the Bible teaches me to slay and eat have I not a right to eat flesh?

A. Yes, a legal right and your Bible right, but not a moral right.

Q. Do not some people believe it is right to slay and eat lower animals?

A. Yes, from their palate, but all honorable conscientious men see a wrong in taking life.

Q. Has not environment throughout one's life something to do with our eating of flesh?

A. Yes, but come out of it and be in line with a grander, nobler and consistent life. Lay aside your palate and let your conscience rule.

Q. Is not the devil in your philosophy?

A. It seems so to you because it is an expose of churchianity, proving beyond question the nothingness of the flesh eating religionist's piety.

Q. Suppose man lives in a country where he cannot find vegetarian food?

A. Then he might be justified in eating flesh to preserve his life.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. If there is no personal God, who created this world?

A. It is a scientific proposition, and so acknowledged by all thinking men.

Q. Do church people get angry at your philosophy?

A. Yes, sometimes, as when their conscience is seared by a hot iron.

Q. Have not vegetables life?

A. Not life which suffers an evident pain nor do they flee when you threaten to pluck them. Such a question is invariably asked by a carnivorous wiseacre.

Q. Why are all Vegetarians lank, lean and skinny?

A. Because you like the taste of meat and intend to continue eating it.

Q. I know animals have fear and pain, but supposing God did place them on earth for man to slay and eat, what then?

A. "God" is no better then than your "devil."

Q. What were animals created for?

A. What were YOU created for?

Q. What is your conception of God?

A. Nature. Higher self—Conscience.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Do you not kill insects when you drink water; and do you not cripple and trample harmless bugs to death with every step you take?

A. Yes, but involuntarily and not with premeditation and not selfishly to satisfy an inhuman desire or appetite.

Q. Would you "swat" a fly or kill a flea or a snake?

A. If a pest or venomous reptile disturbed my peace and quiet I would be justified in protecting myself.

Q. Is not the survival of the fittest a natural law; consequently being superior I may slay and eat?

A. That's your idea because the "fittest" is yourself—in your own estimation and power; but there's no godliness in such a contention. It is your selfish conclusion that might is right at the expense of sentient life.

Q. Do I not work hard and do I not know that I need meat to sustain me in my manual labor? Do I not know what my system needs.

A. Your system does not require food which must come from a murdered animal! When you contend that you must subsist on flesh, you know not whereof you speak. You are talking to uphold your inhuman appetite.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Where would medical research be were it not for vivisection (torture) and killing animals for experiment in the interest of science?

A. I do not know, but I do know scientific men have not a moral right to torture and kill harmless, helpless animals. Experimenting in surgery, etc., should be done on humans who believe in the advancement of medical science at the expense of life.

Q. Do you object to the infidel eating flesh food?

A. I do not object to anyone eating flesh food—eat whatever you like, but I do point out the wrong of taking life and I emphatically say the religious institution upholding slaughter is a farce and a pharisaical monument to a man-made diety.

Q. Do you actually consider flesh eating the most abominable of sins?

A. Yes, absolutely the most abominable.

Q. What do you think of religious emotionalism and ecstasy?

A. If from the mouth of a carnivorous worshipper it is sham and pretense—a mockery.

Q. Is not your feeling toward animals mawkish sentimentality?

A. There is no such thing as mawkish sentimentality in decrying inhumanity.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Do not the lower animals prey upon one another, and do not the big fish eat the little fish?

A. You profess to be above the inferior animals and you profess to have a soul; you also have a Golden Rule supposed to have been handed down by a kind and merciful Creator.

Q. What shall we do with all the animals if we do not kill them?

A. Is that why you eat flesh?

Q. Do you really think carnivorous churchites are not of God?

A. I don't *think* it, I *know* it *absolutely*, because I know it is wrong to kill and I know they know it and I know they search the Scriptures for "proof" to satisfy palate while Conscience rebels.

Q. What do you think of a religionist who says, "I am living under a new dispensation since Christ came and went, and I now eat anything the Lord sets before me?"

A. If he means he can eat at the expense of sentient life he is not a Godly man; he is not living in harmony with the Golden Rule; he is not living according to the promptings of a higher self, consequently the God spirit is dormant.

The church carnivora's favorite Bible quotations to justify his inhumanity are invariably quoted from a petrified conscience and the region of the palate. Here are several of the passages:

"There is nothing from without a man, entering into him can defile him; but the things which come out of him, those are they that defile the man."

"For one believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs. But to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean to him it is unclean."

"Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils. Speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them, which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

"In a trance I saw a vision; a certain vessel descend as it had been a great sheet let down from heaven by four corners. I considered and saw four-footed beasts of the earth and beasts and creeping things and fowls of the air; and a voice said unto me, Arise, Peter, slay and eat."

IN AND BETWEEN THE LINES

The Bible says: Be not among eaters of flesh.

The Bible says: It is better to hear the rebuke of the wise than to hear the hymns of fools.

The Bible says: If an animal dieth of itself do not eat it but give it to thy neighbor and let him eat thereof.

The Bible says: Who knoweth that the spirit of man goeth upward and the spirit of the beast goeth downward?

The Bible says: Your stomachs are an open sepulchre.

The Bible says: Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

The Bible says: Prove all things and hold fast ot that which is good.

The Bible says: Do not be as the hypocrites are, testifying in public places and yet living apart from God.

The Bible says: Reason is too high for a fool.

The Bible says: He that follows after mercy findeth life.

The Bible says: The wise man's eyes are in his head (he reasons), but the fool's eyes are neither here nor there, he walketh in darkness.

IN AND BETWEEN THE LINES.

The Bible says: When a man's ways are in harmony with higher consciousness he maketh his enemies be at peace with him.

The Bible says: The Spirit of God made Samson a murderer.

The Bible says: The beasts of the field shall honor me.

The Bible says: Fool thou art to believe all that the prophets have said.

The Bible says: God sent plagues to torment his people.

The Bible says: Shed not innocent blood.

The Bible says: Praise the Lord every living creature—the beasts of the field, the birds of the air and earth, the fish of the waters and all mankind.

The Bible says: Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.

The Bible says: Thou art weighed in the balances and art found wanting.

The Bible says: There are many false lords and false gods the people are worshipping.

The Bible says: Come now, let us reason together.

The Bible says: Faith without works is dead.

The Bible says: He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a human.

IN AND BETWEEN THE LINES.

The Bible says: Beast and man have one breath; so that man hath no pre-eminence above the beast; as one dieth so dieth the other.

The Bible says: Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.

The Bible says: Every moving thing that liveth (grain, fruits, vegetables, nuts, etc.) shall be food for you, but flesh with the life thereof which is blood shall ye not eat.

The Bible says: God blessed every creature.

The Bible says: Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of the earth and every tree, on the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for food.

The Bible says: All that cry Lord, Lord, are not of God.

The Bible says: They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my Holy Mountain.

The Bible says: I am God, I change not.

The Bible says: Do a little consistent heart cleaning so that the human mind's eye shall be spiritual to see and segregate right from wrong.

The Bible says: Christ taught love, leniency, forgiveness, tenderness and mercy.

The Bible says: Dead flies cause the apothecary's ointment to send forth a stinking savour.

Capital punishment or legalized murder is another miscarriage of consistency; it does not dovetail into mercy and it does not blend into the law that God has given man an allotted time upon the earth. What right have twelve jurors to virtually cancel the life of a murderer? Incarcerate the offender under a life sentence with proper food and training, and ultimately that murderer's heart and soul might be purer than Judge, jurors and all connected with the courts of justice.

If a criminal under excitement or cool premeditation takes the life of a human being, the cool, considerate jurors, responsible for the death penalty, are just as guilty of murder as the prisoner.

The butcher is rejected as a juror on a murder trial on the ground that his business has hardened his heart, and yet the Judge of the Superior Court, the sheriff and his deputies and the eligible jurors all eat of the beef the butcher slaughters.

Despite the protests that may come to the surface in reading the inspired, pointed truths, the fact should be reiterated that Justice, Kindness and Mercy for every living creature is in the heart and soul of the true religionist.

The sand-blind carnivorous faith curist (who reads his Bible through a pair of eye-glasses not made by God Almighty) tells us of a divine healing power.

We hear many testimonies from the lips of these people praising this wonderful (?) curative agency, but when sensibly considered we know the "power" removes only visionary ills.

Imaginary tumors, etc., hypochondria and other nervous troubles readily yield to this mythical physician, but no disease or defect in reality, can be removed until we remove the physical cause.

If we continue living regardless of natural health laws all the "belief" and all the "faith" and all the "Blood" cannot offset the inevitable result of continued disobedience.

They sometimes speculate as to the stubbornness and apparent incurability of an ailment and finally lay the blame to a spiritual insufficiency. Ridiculous!

Mankind is filled with patriotism when a victorious war is ended, forgetting the awful gloom pervading some poor mother's home. The higher self should make us grieve with those that grieve rather than be exultant at the loss or downfall of any nation. We should love all nations and nationalities as we do our own, and be bound together by inseparable bonds, realizing that we all must pass to the final tomb of man on the same level.

A bow of horse hair coming in contact with the gut strings of a violin produces exquisite harmony that thrills every fibre of our being with ecstasy. We can attribute the melody to the spirit of the deceased animal appealing to the human heart. Strange that after life has departed we can charm the muses with tones produced on a stringed instrument. What human being has ever bequeathed to the world a substance to awaken the emotions of our soul through concord of sweet sounds like unto the gut of a deceased animal? Evidently there is more harmony in the entrails of lower creatures than we find in the entire carcass of religious civilized carnivorous man.

The scientist who upholds painful experimental surgery in the interest of science should give over his own body for experiment instead of encouraging the cruelties of vivisection. It hurts being "cut to pieces," consequently the heartless scientific fellow, instead of offering his own body for the dissecting table, tortures a poor friendless dog or other animal.

The horrible suffering thousands of helpless creatures have undergone through the process of vivisection is heartrending.

There should be stringent law against such inhumanity.

A DEVOUT (?) ADMONITION.

E. E. Kusel,

Los Angeles, Cal.

Sir: I read your "Humanitarian Philosophy" booklet and I take it as a mass of devil talk. It is not in favor of the Holy Bible and it says it is wrong to kill animals. This is crossing God's word. You say it says swine meat is forbidden. That is the only true statement in your book but that is the law for the Jews only. You say it says thou shalt not kill; of course it does, and that has references to the human family only. You say the religious man that does not shudder at the works of a butcher is heartless and godless. You tell a falsehood there. I have been a believer fifteen years and I know all animals were made for man.

I can see the devil has a powerful influence over you as it had over Voltaire, Paine, Ingersoll, Edison, Hubbard and other non-believers. You infidels preach against God's Bible and will be burned in the everlasting fires of hell for it. You will be glad to have a drop of cold water in your suffering, but god will not have mercy—it will be too late then.

Hell is full of agnostics and infidels and non-believers burning and suffering and I warn you to have a care as to what you say.

The Catholics and Christian Scientists are as much of the devil's doings as you are, so you'll have company if you do not repent of your infidelity.

You are adding to God's word and it is punishable by his wrath (Rev. 22:18.)

Your book is a lot of lies and infidelity.

N. S. W.

Birmingham, Ala., Jan. 30, 1911.

A REPLY.

Mr. N. S. W.,

Birmingham, Ala.

My dear sir: In reply to your letter of Jan. 30th, concerning my "Humanitarian Philosophy," I wish to candidly tell you that I am not at all afraid of your sort of god. The God I worship is not very likely to materialize in a selfish fanatical subject, but always comes to the surface in the heart and soul of honorable, conscientious thinking men—men who either profess nothing and live according to custom or in men who profess religion and uphold their God as kind, loving and merciful.

This latter man is an ethical vegetarian and will not accept the cruelties and inconsistencies of the Bible but says "it is an error in translation."

As to the lower animals, one preying upon the other, the conscientious, devout Bible believer presents the theory of his own freeing God Almighty from the sinful responsibility. He divides Bible truth from Bible error—he accepts the lofty and beautiful and holds fast to that which is good.

If you intend to preach a gospel of Love you will find it an utter impossibility to do so if you do not live a Humanitarian life—a life that forbids the killing of any thing that suffers pain, and fear of death as you yourself may sometimes suffer.

In conclusion I wish to impress you with the fact that your letter is sufficient proof that you read the Bible in a haphazard style and know not its contents.

Every assertion, every quotation and every conclusion in my "Humanitarian Philosophy," my dear sir, is absolutely true and justified.

Respectfully,

E. E. KUSEL.

FROM THE W. A. T. L.

The tobacco smoking on street cars has been very much discussed in your valuable paper recently. Now, I will suggest that all persons who object to the poisonous effects of tobacco register a protest every chance they get and spend some good money, as I am doing, to back up their argument against the most deadly plant used by human beings. There is no traffic so degrading in its influence and effect as tobacco. It goes hand in hand with liquor, and when we stop the youth of the land from using the weed, then the saloon will have no customers.

G. L. R.

Founder World's Anti-Tobacco League,
Los Angeles, Cal.

(From Los Angeles Herald.)

THE "WORST" SIN.

The church element construe the Bible to blend into their own desires and appetites and then in the name of their god (little g) they commit every iniquity under the sun, the most abominable of which is the eating of "a beef which has been battered in the head by the blow of an ax or mutton which has had its throat cut from ear to ear."

Get yourself in touch with the Infinite and you will see that the taking of animal life for food is a greater sin than smoking, drinking or satisfying animal desires. The three last named are only sinning against the body but not commendable by any means, while the first is the horrible sin of taking life.

Carnivorous reader (church people included) think these lines over well and then move thy tongue seven times before thou speakest of sin!

E. E. KUSEL.

Los Angeles, Cal.

(From Los Angeles Herald.)

MAN AND BEAST.

What queer and wild notions religious faddists get into their heads. T. J. W. wants us to quit killing cattle and hogs, etc., in fact all kinds of animals and birds because God has put them on earth. I would like Mr W. to tell us what would become of us if we followed his advice. Why, the animals would crowd man off the earth in a short while. The farmer could not raise any crops. Cattle, deer, hares and sheep would eat his grain, the coyotes his chickens and the lions would eat him.

C. V. Pasadena, Cal.
(From Los Angeles Herald.)

VEGETARIAN'S REPLY.

If you please, Mr. V., I am not a "religious faddist." I am not religious at all. I am a firm believer in the Golden Rule, applying it to man and beast.

In reply to your query, Mr. V. I will answer briefly: Self-preservation is the first law of nature, so protect yourself against the presumed invasion of tame and wild beasts, birds, etc., but do not presume we have the right to take life of anything which endures pain or runs away from impending danger unless occasion calls for it.


My letter to the Herald, if you please, was for those who profess to be godly and "in the kingdom." Religious people must be strictly humane or they are minus the God character and their profession is either a phantom or hypocrisy.

Of course men like yourself, who are afraid of being crowded off the earth, have a special self-given right to raise and cruelly slaughter any living creature for eating.

Meat eating will continue until the end of the world, no doubt, but the Humanitarian will not eat it; it will be devoured by ungodly church people and outsiders who like the flavor of flesh food, regardless of the wrong of premeditated killing.

T. J. W.
Compton, Cal.

(From Los Angeles Herald.)





14 DAY USE

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

28 Jan 5 8 BF

REC'D LD

JAN 17 1958

Photomount
Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros.
Makers
Stockton, Calif.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

U. C. BERKELEY LIB



CD4588894

671714

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRA

THIS BOOK

